Title: Bestiaries of Feeling: Flies, Snails, Toads and Spiders in Richard Lovelace's *Lucasta*: *Posthume Poems* (1659)

Abstract: A number of poems in Lovelace's *Posthume Poems* describe tiny creatures: snails, spiders, flies, ants and toads. These poetic subjects are bound up literally in their own or others' substances - ingested or digested by spider's webs, toad's spume or magpies' bellies. This essay reads these tiny bodies as metaphors for particular affective states closely connected to the intestine conflicts of civil war. Interpreting these feelings through a combination of contemporary affect theory, and the symbolic histories of these tiny creatures within the emblem book tradition, this essay argues these poems draw attention to how the material losses experienced by Royalists render the emotional demands of exemplary self-fashioning increasing difficult to sustain. Lyric poetry becomes an unexpectedly appropriate vehicle to articulate this ambivalence. Declared surplus to requirements (at least by Thomas Hobbes) in the new and heavily politicised aesthetic proposed by William Davenant and Hobbes in *The Preface to Gondibert* (1650), these "tiny creature" poems exploit the perceived inadequacies of the lyric form to diagnose the conditions of a non-monarchical world.

Keywords: Lovelace, Cavalier, affect, exemplarity, *Posthume Poems*

Author: Ruth Connolly

Affiliation: Newcastle University

Address: Percy Building, Newcastle University, Newcastle-upon-Tyne, NE1 7RU

Tel: (0191) 2088133

Email: ruth.connolly@ncl.ac.uk

Disclosure Statement

The author confirms that she has no financial interest or benefit arising from this research.

Anthony à Wood's evocative account of Lovelace's miserable end concentrates on how he looked and where he lived. He laments that in Lovelace's final years he wore "ragged cloaths (whereas when he was in his glory he wore Cloth of gold and silver) and mostly lodged in obscure and dirty places, more befitting the worst of beggars".[1] The association of Lovelace with rags, dirt and dejection positions him as an example of self-sacrificial Cavalier loyalty, suffering and humiliation. Lovelace's own poetry concerned itself with celebrating the warmth and enduring strength of Cavalier solidarity, most famously in "The Grasshopper". There the "genuine summer in each other's breast" created by "the best of *Men* and *Friends*!" (l. 21) served as a synecdoche for a mutually secured affective space that is material, sociable and enduring.[2] As James Loxley notes, it is the "continued self-possession" of the speakers which provides the "capacity for action that their frozen antithesis so strikingly lacks."[3] Wood's history suggests this space eventually proved illusory, for the poet at least. Like the beggar, Lovelace in his final days stood outside the law for want of possessions and position.

This is in part because what secures the internal space in "The Grasshopper" is the ability of the speaker and his friend each to exemplify the roles to which they are mutually assigned. The importance of these textual formations of exemplary royalism is evident from the collection of prison writings created by Sir John Gibson, an imprisoned captain of horse held at Durham Castle from 1653 to at least 1657.[4]

Gibson compared himself to kings called John who had lost their kingdoms: "And I poore John, beinge but Charolophylos, a freind to a King, am vnfortunate & w*i*th St Paul, in prisons frequent, yet I humbly submit, for, *Regis ad exemplum totus componitur orbis* [the example of kings shapes the world]; and as he led mee the way I am willinge to follow."[5] Gibson manages the crisis of imprisonment by reiterating the tropes and commonplaces of Cavalier heroism and the resolute suffering of the loyal prisoner.[6] Even as he finds pattern and meaning in the example of those who share his name and his beliefs, his collection sensitively registers the shame of being held in prison, his fears for his reputation, doubts about his own loyalty (a favoured image is Peter as the cock crows), and a fluctuating sense of hope and despair that "like Ixion's" wheel "still turns around w*i*thout surcease."[7] Yet Gibson also scribbles in a margin that there is "No Constancy like that of Cavalliers: which never shrinks by force, nor sordid ffeares" and includes a poem, heavily indebted to Lovelace's "To Althea, from Prison", which may be his own composition.[8]

Images of loyal suffering and endurance rely on the maintenance of certain affective states, but as Gibson's collection indicates, the stoicism of resolute endurance formed only part of the affective landscape of postwar royalism. The significance of feeling in Cavalier poetry is recognised in virtually every study yet it rarely is an explicit focus of attention even when its influence drives changes in that poetry's style and expression. Joshua Scodel, in his discussion of the "cruder mode" of the post-regicide Cavalier

drinking poem links this collective approach to "a feeling that a Cavalier can do no more than shamefully survive".[9] Critical discussion of Lovelace's *Lucasta: Posthume Poems* (1659) frequently connect – and even collapse – its affective states into its aesthetic features. Modern judgements of this collection, published two years after Lovelace's death, describe a verse heavily stained by circumstances. It possesses a "sordid carnality", is concerned with "obscure and dirty" places, and marked by a "louche and cynical" tone.[10] Nigel Smith breaks with this critical dissatisfaction, though qualifying his claim by arguing that "even as it excels itself" *Posthume Poems* marks a literary dead end for this literary mode.[11] The volume's title has a more than autobiographical reference, it seems. My aim here is to draw a fresh set of connections between the performance and management of affects in the *Posthume Poems*, and the troubling question of how to exemplify royalism, and write royalist literature, in the absence of the king, possessions and positions that made it meaningful. I outline a more critically self-conscious approach to reading affect in these poems which attends to the literary and political dynamics of royalist feeling in a (seemingly) post-royalist world. Smith rightly sees *Posthume Poems* as representing a major achievement. It addresses the quotidian consequences of Royalist military, political and cultural failures through a style reliant on tonal instability and emotional illegibility. In mapping one through the other, Lovelace makes his own polemical point about the affinity of lyric forms with the affective logic of the post-regicide world.

In his ekphrastic poem "To my Worthy Friend Mr Peter Lilly: on that excellent Picture of his Majesty, and the Duke of Yorke, drawne by him at Hampton-Court", Lovelace elevates painting over poetry, arguing poetry's capacity to signify extends only to representation, not the thing itself, whereas Lely's art captures the whole quality of his subject.[12] Poetry lacks the instant affective legibility that Lovelace attributes to Lely's "line", a legibility that communicates the precise feelings experienced by the visual artist's subjects: "Thou sorrow canst designe without a teare,/And with the Man his very Hope or Feare;" (29-30). The poem's opening word "see!" is its most important, and the narrative of the poem centres on as the knowing look of - and at - the painting's regal subjects. That look is delivered, received and observed by King, prince, painter and poet, drawing all four into a shared and carefully hierarchical political and aesthetic model. Visual art is the cultural mode that best captures the mutual self-regard that is at the heart of the monarchy's functioning. As Loxley points out, the poem "attributes to Lely the aesthetic and political clarity of vision it needs for itself".[13] Yet in some of its lyrics *Posthume Poems* turns that lack of clarity to its advantage. When that monarchy no longer functions, these poems are best placed to represent the affective experience of its collapse because the mode and its subjects are both now, inevitably, mired in the opaque materiality which Lely's lines disdain.

A subset of poems in *Posthume Poems* which describe tiny creatures: snails, spiders, flies, ants and toads is directly concerned with this materiality. These poetic subjects are bound up literally in their own or others' substances, ingested or digested by spider's webs, toad's spume or magpies' bellies. Rather than remaining, as Lely's subjects do, at an appropriate degree of mutual distance, these creatures come excessively close together. I see these tiny bodies as metaphors for particular affective states closely connected to the intestine conflicts of civil war. Susan James has argued that early modern depiction of emotions treat them as "intrinsic physical manifestations which are written on the body".[14] In drawing on this argument to consider literary depictions of non-human bodies, I argue that that the treatments of these toads, snails, flies and spiders in *Posthume Poems* register an ambivalent resistance to the demands of exemplarity by drawing attention to how the material losses experienced by Royalists render the emotional demands of exemplary royalist self-fashioning increasing difficult to sustain. Lyric poetry becomes an unexpectedly appropriate vehicle to articulate this ambivalence. These poems make renewed but complicated use of the emblematic practices that Lovelace praised Lely for making redundant. Lyric had been declared surplus to requirements, at least by Thomas Hobbes, in the new and heavily politicised aesthetic proposed by William Davenant and Hobbes in *The Preface to Gondibert* (1650).[15] The *Preface* insisted that poetry and poets must produce exemplary models to imitate, both in terms of the characters depicted and the poetic models chosen. In his "Answer" to Davenant, which forms

part of the *Preface*, Hobbes excludes lyric from his taxonomy of poetry, declaring it formally inadequate: 'sonnets, Epigrammes, Eclogues, and the like peeces (which are but Essayes, and partes of an entire Poeme)" are not "Poesy".[16] Combining a newly denigrated verse form with tones drawn from comedy, itself a freshly complicated and ambivalent mode, these "tiny creature" poems exploit the perceived inadequacies of the lyric form and the art of poetry itself to diagnose the conditions of a non-monarchical world.

Finding feeling in the *Posthume Poems*

Few lyric collections had met the demand for exemplarity quite as effectively as *Lucasta* (1649). It creates, Thomas Corns has argued, a "single synthesising voice which offers itself as the expression of quintessential Cavalierism".[17] Yet many of the signifying practices found in the tiny creature poems are anticipated in Andrew Marvell's prescient commendatory poem to the same collection. Despite the reputation of its poet and indeed some of its contents, several other commendatory poems to *Lucasta* makes its lack of engagement with immediate historical circumstances the source of its power. Colonel John Pinchbecke, like several other contributors, emphasises Lovelace's ability "[...] to divert our sorrowes by thy straines,/Making us quite forget our seven yeeres paines" (26-27).[18] The poet's younger brother, Francis, acknowledges that Lovelace might wonder why so many poets, fourteen in all, "with officious care thus guard thy gate,/As if thy Child were

illegitimate?" (9-10).[19] The careful patrol of the volume's boundaries by all these poets, four of whom bear the rank of colonel, means the chivalric world within its leaves can continue to offer temporary and essential respite from the historical moment. Marvell identifies the vulnerability of these boundaries of feeling by casting Lovelace's critics and censors as tiny, spiteful predators who "against you rise in arms" (18): they are "the envious caterpillar" (15), the "Word-peckers, Paper-rats, Book-scorpions" (19), who will chew through the physical matter of the book.[20] The joke is that the defence of the volume's sheets will be conducted by ladies "yet undrest", (39) who sally forth to assault both licensers and admirers alike. Lois Potter and Gerald Hammond have pointed out the "mock-heroic" quality of this image - Potter sees the "slightly ludicrous" quality of the image as a wry joke at the expense of the "Cavalier hero" - but the ladies" heroics are suitable to the diminished stature of Lovelace's enemies.[21] The censors, the "unfashioned sons" (20) of the Presbytery, are the natural opponents of these artfully disordered women. Marvell's poem reiterates the strength of the lyric poet to act for and sustain his community through his own art, but that art is reduced not by any failure on the poet's part but by the intellectual and affective "smallness" of his opponents.[22] Marvell's poem deftly alters the scale of the expected attack but without diluting its intensity; however morally shrunken Lovelace's enemies are, they are nonetheless able to inflict a significant amount of material damage both to *Lucasta* and its loyal adherents. It is also, Marvell hints, mock rather than male heroics that will provide the strongest defence on this particular battleground. The nature and

implications of that material damage dominates the *Posthume Poems* stylistically and politically. In "The Toad and Spyder. A Duell", a poem which describes a fight to the death between the two combatants, the liquid released in their struggle forms the matter of the poem.[23]

> And now me thinks a Sphynx's wing
>
> I pluck, and do not write but sting;
>
> With their black blood, my pale inks blent
>
> Gall's but a faint Ingredient. (87-90)

The two "dreaded enemies" (7) meet in an ominous atmosphere "under a deadly Hen-bane shade", [...] Having their weapons in their eyes" (5, 9). The real weapons, however, turn out to be bodily fluids, "foam" (11), "slime" (33), "discoloured spumes" (45), "disgorged Lakes" (68) of spit and poison which the duellers hurl at each other. The poem allegorises the civil wars of the pen, combatants flinging poisons in black ink at each other's heads, the speaker reduced to another of these tiny assailants. The words themselves are poisonous yet the poem, Leslie Semler argues, achieves an "ambivalent comic distance" from the visceral detail it repeatedly supplies.[24] The mock-heroic struggle of spider and toad means the poem's graphic accounts of torture and battle are not to be taken seriously, diminished in significance by their protagonists" insignificance.[25] The poem is uneasy with its own writing,

uncertain as to the appropriate affective stances to take towards these tiny combatants.

This lack of resolution strikingly at odds with the commitment of the poem's protagonists occurs again and again in the "tiny creature" poems. Recently affect theory has begun to pay more attention to what are deemed "minor affects", irresolute, non-prestigious and ignoble feelings, those described by the contemporary theorist Sianne Ngai as "ugly feelings".[26] Ngai's examples include paranoia, anxiety, envy and irritation and her discussion focuses on the aesthetics and politics of these "ugly feelings", including their canonical politics. Ugly feelings are those which cause the subject to experience "pain or displeasure" either as a result of the feeling itself or because the feeling is coded, socially and morally, as weak or unpleasant.[27] That lack of value extends to those experiencing the feelings and to the texts which articulate them. "Ugly feelings" are commonly found in non-prestigious genres or, as with Lovelace, in a writer's less well-known or less canonically valued work, suggesting a reciprocity between the presence of these affects and the literary esteem granted their bearers. The expression of these affects is characterised by gaps, absences and uncertainties. They are difficult-to-read feelings which produce, and are the products of, difficult-to-read texts that often turn "entirely on the interpretive problems posed by an emotional illegibility".[28] Ngai proposes that whilst emotions which motivate people to action are strategic, ugly feelings are diagnostic. Her major insights build

from her focus on particular negative affects which index an increase or decrease in a subject's power to act.[29] What they disclose and interpret, she proposes, are conditions of powerlessness, political conditions where an individual or collective agency is obstructed, restricted or suspended. Paying special attention to ambivalent or "ugly" affects therefore, as Ngai notes, offers a means to usefully explore how "sociohistorical and ideological dilemmas, in particular, produce formal or representational ones".[30] Approaching Lovelace's *Posthume Poems* from the point-of-view that they were composed from a position where the forms of political and aesthetic agency available to the poet are indeed limited, we can begin to unpack how their affects and aesthetics conjoin to diagnose a problem of exemplarity. The "tiny creature" poems possess a tactile and somatic aesthetic that is, as many critics have noted, clotted in expression and meaning. That aesthetic is a formal response to the ideological dilemma of postwar Cavalierism. As "The Toad and Spyder" suggests, its affects sensitively index the degrees of obstructed or suspended aesthetic and politic agency experienced by the male Cavalier poet. These affects gather around moments of pointless exemplarity, and the meta-responses typical of ugly feelings, the feeling that you should not be feeling that feeling, are managed through a resort to comedy.

The *Posthume Poem* "To a Lady with Child that ask'd an Old Shirt" introduces this vision of the postwar Cavalier aesthetic.[31] It returns to a familiar metaphor of poetry as childbirth and, by the end of the poem, as the metaphors for texts and writing

multiply, it becomes evident that we are to think of its addressee as Lovelace's own muse.

And why an honour'd ragged Shirt, that shows,

Like tatter'd Ensigns, all its Bodies blows?

Should it be swathed in a vest so dire,

It were enough to set the Child on fire;

Dishevell'd Queens should strip them of their hair,

And in it mantle the new rising Heir:

Nor do I know ought worth to wrap it in,

Except my parchment upper-coat of skin:

Then expect no end of its chast tears,

That first was rowl'd in down, now fur of bears. (1-10)

The shirt is a reminder of a more glorious past and of a more glorious poetics too. Clothing a personified Poetry can be an assertion of poetic power. Ben Jonson, in the dedicatory epistle to *Volpone*, vowed to "raise the despised head of poetry again, and stripping her out of those rotten and base rags, wherewith the times have adulterated her form, restore her to her primitive habit, feature, and majesty[.]".[32] In Lovelace's

poem, the new "Heir" (6) to a clearly uncertain patrimony will be wrapped in a reeking shirt, the shorn hair of a Queen, or bloodied skin flayed from the poet's body, which will provide the child with a pilch, "a outer garment made of animal skin with the fur used as a lining".[33] The abject hairy skin is a reminder of the importance of hair in the Cavalier self-image, and of the history of writing on dressed animal skin. The implications of stripping oneself of shirt and skin are suggested in another poem in the same collection, "The Triumphs of Philamore and Amoret" (datable to Charles Cotton's wedding in 1656), in which Cotton is depicted as the returning sun of patronage.[34] Depicted as a monarch removed on a royal progress, he returns having won over the North.

> So from the taught North, when you shall return
>
> To glad those looks that ever since did mourn,
>
> When men unclothed of themselves you"l see,
>
> Then start new made, fit, what they ought to be; (45-48)

The idea of the "North" taught by the "sun" of the monarchy is an image which is not entirely metaphorical. Pierre Charron's *Of Wisdom* stated an early modern truism when he observed that geographical location and the associated local climate predisposed specific populations to certain passions, because of the action of the climate on their bodily humours.

> The Northernes are of a phlegmatick and sanguine temperature, quite contrarie to the Southerne; and therefore haue contrary qualities, saue that they agree in this one, that they are likewise cruell and inhumane, but by another reason, that is, for want of iudgement, whereby like beasts, they know not how to conteine and gouerne themselues.[35]

Cotton brings the monarchical sun to this cold climate and the heat of his example alters the Northerners" humoural dispositions, intensifying their susceptibility to certain emotions, chief amongst them the desire to obey and emulate him.[36] Monarchical power is understood here as an affective power that operates at a bodily level. Cotton's return to the south is to men whose inner dispositions are already inclined towards him but whose outer forms are in need of embellishment. The idea of "men unclothed of themselves" suggests the self as a form of clothing which establishes identity, status and belonging. The outside is not, as in much devotional poetry, equated with "the outside of things with deception and the distractions of worldly vanity", but instead is a marker of who and what one should be.[37] It is the monarch's gaze and presence that makes this self-possession possible.

The self-stripping in "Upon a Lady" asserts a loss of that possession, but the poem goes further to include not only shirt but skin. This loss of a layer of essential self-protection in a poetic as obsessed, as Lovelace's is, with enclosure signals acute crisis. Thomas Traherne writes in *Christian Ethicks*, "the Skin importeth Death for as much

as it cannot be fleyed off, without the Destruction of the Creature".[38] Unlike the Neoplatonic paradoxes in *Lucasta*, most famously in "To Althea, from Prison", in which the enclosing and enclosed body is effortlessly transcended, the image of the self-skinning poet in these lines marks that body as the principal sites where royalism's political defeats and affective failures are experienced and read.[39]

The turning point in the poem comes when it shifts expressly to the comic mode. The speaker looks "[t]o the nine Sempstresses, my former friends" (13) for assistance in finding the sought-for fabric. Despite being down to their last "shreds and ends" (14), the scraps of the poet's own practice, it is the "jolli'st of the three times three" (15) – Thalia, the Muse of comedy – who finally gives the speaker her apron. The newly reduced poet offers a "clout" (18) – a rag or patch – from it to his own muse to wrap her child. The "soft and gentle" (17) quality of the cloth provides a small amount of swaddling clothes for the newborn poem; a later definition of "pilch" in Blount's *Glossographia* (1674) as "a flannel cloth to wrap about the lower part of young children".[40] The lyric is the clout, of course.[41] A poetic birth wrapped in the shreds of Thalia's apron suggests a verse of ragged comedy and performative shortfall delivered (literally) from within a context of financial and literary impoverishment. It also negotiates a distancing from the more serious implications of the dramatic self-stripping earlier in the poem. Once again, a graphic metaphor of poetic and social collapse is not to be taken too seriously. The poem reasserts a commitment to lyric,

but one which explicitly recognises and seeks to articulate the sociohistorical circumstances in which it is embedded. This requires and produces a new lyric style interested in a distinctive type of critique disclosed by its ugly forms and feelings.

Cavalierism in a comic mode

To turn to the affects and genres that fall within the category of comedy places the work within a mode which had a distinctive inflection in Royalist politics and poetics after the civil wars. Laughter morphs into a profoundly ambivalent polemical weapon strongly associated with embodied rituals of loyalty associated with drinking and performance. The "superiority model" of laughter, the most common way early modern medical and humanist discourses explain laughter, presented it as a sudden (cathartic) response to the subject's realisation of his or her own superiority in relation to another. This results in what is essentially involuntary laughter.[42] The upsurge in printed "drolleries" which recirculated pre-Civil War lyric, much of it stemming from clubbable and sociable networks of pre-civil war London, for the Commonwealth marketplace, made repeated connections between royalism and laughter.[43] These texts functioned polemically as a collective social and public expression of mutually felt scorn at the deformities and folly of the Commonwealth. These publishing and reading practices form part of what Vicki Hseuh has called the "passionate and affective dimensions of politics" in the early modern period.[44] These aspects of the emerging early modern English public sphere, she argues, reveal an "emotional

dimensions" to public reason at odds with Habermas' "deliberative rationality".[45] In this model, collective shared emotion conjoined with intoxication is important to the "formation of political groups and parties" because its expression exercises the collective identity that is at its core.[46] Hseuh's use of the example of ballads suggests that these expressions are most powerfully enacted through genres that strategically intensify the affects at their core by requiring collective embodied performance.[47] Some of the poems in *Posthume Poems*, such as "A Mock Song" and "A Mock Charon" are clearly located within a satiric and rebarbative tradition of postwar Royalist song and aid in just such an identity formation.[48]

Yet others pointed out that to write in the comic mode acknowledged a creeping powerlessness. Laughter's ambivalent role in a newly politicised Royalist poetics is drawn out by Hobbes in *The Preface to Gondibert*. There he makes a link between the "scommatique" genre (satire and comedy) and its champions, "the city and its men", who find reproduced in the mode their own "insincerenesse, inconstancy, and troublesome humour [...] like the mobility, blustring, and impurity of the Aire".[49] An expressly hostile reading is offered by Davenant who, in an early use of the word to mean comic, remarks darkly that "humour is the drunkenesse of a nation that no sleep can cure".[50] Hobbes insists laughter had no place in an epic poem which, concerned as it is with persons of great birth and virtue, is the mode of poetry of greatest value to the state:

> Mirth and laughter is proper to Comedy and Satyre. Great persons [who] haue their minds employed on great designes, haue not leasure enough to laugh, and are pleased with the contemplation of their owne power and vertues, so as they need not the infirmities and vices of other men to recommend themselues to their own fauour by comparison, as all men do, when they laugh.[51]

The statement argues that those possessed of genuine power and virtue will not (indeed potentially cannot) feel any impulse to laugh. In a detailed review of Hobbes" theorisation of laughter across all his work, Patrick Giamario argues that, for Hobbes, laughing is a sign of the emotion of vainglory, an emotion that discloses the lack of the power or virtue which those who laugh think they possess. Their laughter reveals their basic misapprehension of the real situation. The perception of superiority felt by the person laughing is imagined rather than real yet even though it is imaginary, this perception disturbs and confuses relations of power.[52] This clarifies Hobbes' concerns in the quotation above and outlines the larger problem: reliance of the affects and genres of comedy may align Royalists with a strategically useful confusion of power relations but it is one which is ultimately highly unstable and antithetical to the proper exercise of sovereign power. Lovelace's use of comedy in the *Posthume Poems* exploits that instability to make the point that disordered affects are the basic condition of a non-monarchical world.

In "Lucasta Laughing", the protagonist, variously identified as Lovelace's muse and as the symbol of his poetry, laughs at the "sinister-handed woe" of the world clad in mourning.[53] Confronted with the appeals of the crowd who "cry, One drop let fall/From her, might save the universal Ball" (ll. 4-5), she emulates the cruel laughing mistresses of pre-war love lyric in refusing to share the emotions of her weeping lovers, preferring to laugh "at our ridiculous pain;/And at our merry misery" (ll. 7-8). Robert Burton's persona of Democritus Junior noted that a person might laugh or weep at folly: "Heraclitus the Philosopher, out of a serious meditation of mens actions fell a weeping, and with continuall teares bewailed their miserie, madnesse, and folly. Democritus on the other side burst out a laughing, their whole life to him seem'd so ridiculous".[54] But whilst laughter serves Democritus Junior as an appropriate ethical response and as an essential corrective for vice, in this poem, laughter provides only physiological relief from melancholy as it

> makes her spleen contract,
>
> And her just pleasure feast;
>
> For the unjustest act
>
> is still the pleasantest jest. (18-21)

The involuntary and amoral nature of this laughter joins it with the other involuntary actions Lois Potter sees as characterising Royalist depictions of defeat: drunkenness,

possession by witchcraft, monstrous births, internal invasions by external forces. These are used, she argues, as a means to manage guilt by depicting "the writer as a helpless figure".[55] The poem's co-option of laughter into this regime produces an affective logic where the poem is turned in on itself. Laughing at its own suffering provides momentary relief in a situation which lacks any sign of a literary or ethical agency that can relieve it. "A Fly about a glasse of burnt claret" makes this point explicitly.[56]

The poem is written from the perspective of a lone drinker watching a fly unwittingly drown itself in his wineglass. Wine is the *leitmotif* of Cavalier verse, a sign of the public sociability that marks Hseuh's moments of affective and embodied, and the fly is a symbol of erotic desire familiar from the host of poems that depict its happy death in the beams of a mistress's eye.[57] The opening stanzas treat wine as a symbol of heat, lust, and devotion that eventually distracts its followers from their vocations. Then in a mid-poem shift, the speaker switches to consider the fly buzzing about his glass, imagining how it sees the situation:

> Viewing the Ruby-christal shine,
>
> Thou tak'st it for a Heaven-Christalline;
>
> Anon thou wilt be taught to groan,
>
> 'Tis an ascended *Acheron*. (9-12)

This misapprehension by the fly will produce its tragedy. The glass of hot wine is mistaken by the fly as a theatre of action, prompting the speaker to enquire:

> What airy country hast to save,
>
> Whose plagues thou"lt bury in thy grave?
>
> For even now thou seemst to us
>
> On this Gulphs brink a Curtius. (37-40)

Marcus Curtius, a knight of the Roman republic, rode armed and on horseback, in response to an oracle, into a chasm that had opened in the Forum at Rome. Sealing it with his sacrifice, he saved the city. Curtius was cited in several sermons to the House of Commons in the 1640s as an example of a "propitiary Sacrifice for the country and nation", a symbol of heroic acts which healed breaches in church and state.[58] Fabian Philipps made Charles I a greater Curtius, "a Martyr for his peoples lives", but in 1656 John Evelyn derided Curtius' "vainglorious precipitation" and, in 1657, readers of a new translation of *Don Quixote* were reminded he served that misguided knight as an ideal of honour.[59]

In Lovelace's poem, plunging mock-heroically into the abyss, the fly's sacrifice is all for nought:

> And now th'art fal'n (magnanimous Fly)

In, where thine Ocean doth fry,

Like the Sun's son who blush'd the flood,

To a complexion of blood. (41-44)

This loosely paraphrases Ovid's version of the Phaeton myth, in which Phaeton "fire ravaging his ruddy hair, is hurled headlong and falls with a long trail through the air [...] Him, far from his native land, in another quarter of the globe, Eridanus receives and bathes his steaming face".[60] This allusion introduces the fly's transition from myth to moral emblem of desire. When John Gibson cheered the constancy of Cavaliers, he wrote underneath "non est mortale quod opto" ("what I desire is not subject to death"). Repurposed for emblems books to express a Christian desire, the motto originates from Phoebus' warning to Phaeton, "sors tua mortalis; non est morale quod optas (Thy lot is mortal; not for mortals is that thou askest)".[61] This poem's account has more in common with the troubled account of Phaeton prevailing in the European emblem book tradition with which Lovelace was familiar. There Phaeton's inability to control his horses is a symbol both for recklessness and over-ambition.[62] In Andrea Alciato's enormously popular and much translated *Emblemata*, Phaeton is consistently used to illustrate "In Temerarios", the reckless.[63] Phaeton's status as the son of Phoebus probably drives Alciato's explicitly political gloss on the emblem: "Even so, the majority of kings are borne up to heaven on the wheels of Fortune, driven by youth's ambition. After they have brought great disaster on the human race

and themselves, they finally pay the penalty for all their crimes."[64] An early seventeenth-century Dutch interpretation of the emblem by Schoonhovius uses Phaeton to illustrate "a diatribe against civil war" and a 1615 French translation of Alciato's text also does so: "de ceste presomption & temerité bien souvent s'engendrent des guerres mal fondees, ou, qui pis est, des combustions & embrasements de ligues intestines." ("From this presumptuousness and temerity are ill-founded wars too often bred or, which is worse, the conflagrations and tumults of internal factions").[65] Erasmus, in *De Copia*, made a familiar link with Icarus and treated both figures as reminders that "no-one should undertake to perform a task that is beyond his powers".[66] Shakespeare's use of Phaeton stresses the self-realisation that Phaeton's fall produces: In *Richard II*, the king, in a moment of abruptly intruding self-knowledge, cries "down, down I come, glist'ring Phaeton/Wanting the manage of unruly jades" (3.3.177-8).[67] Phaeton represents the ill-advisedness of following heroic models woefully ill-suited to one's particular circumstances or capacities. The fly, observed from the speaker's distance, thus becomes a blackened and burnt sacrifice to that knowledge. The pertinence of this six-legged creature to a post-Cavalier world seems all too obvious.

But then, in a *deus-ex-machina* moment the speaker fishes the fly out with his little finger, and revives it with his, "warming, cooling breath", an elegant parody of the

breath which God breathed into Adam. Tragedy averted, the comedy begins as the fly immediately takes off to begin his heroic struggle again.

> Burnt Insect! Do you reaspire
>
> The moist-hot-glasse, and liquid fire?
>
> I see! 'tis such a pleasing pain,
>
> Thou would'st be scorch'd, and drown'd again. (53-56)

As an allegory of royalist action it serves as a metaphor for futility and shortsightedness – an irony in the verse of a poet obsessed with seeing. The fly's lack of perceptual awareness provokes and sustains its commitment and drives what is, from its own mistaken point of view, a heroic tragedy. The situation is one of perfect indeterminacy, in which the distant speaker prevents the fly from making its sacrifice but that speaker is in turn unable to prevent the fly from attempting it again.

This particular turn to a comic mode sits within a particular usage identified by Lois Potter in her discussion of how royalist writers deploy generic codes in order to make sense of real-world events. She notes that the term "tragicomedy" is deployed in mid-century print publications across a range of works very different from one another though typically composed by writers with strongly Royalist connections. In accounting for this usage, she argues it comes to describe a certain kind of play in which the significance of the events depicted is uncertain until the denouement which

decides once and for all whether tragic catharsis or comic resolution forms the final outcome. In these dramas, which essentially aestheticise contemporary politics, that conclusion is not easily achieved. Occasionally it is omitted completely as in one four-act play where the final act was simply left unwritten; suggested as lying in a future outside the playworld, or as reliant ultimately on the perspective taken by the spectator. The genre becomes a self-conscious or an even more self-conscious hybrid, characterised by uncertainty, and by an unwillingness or inability to resolve that uncertainty.[68] Lovelace's poem likewise ends neither in resolution nor release, signalling the obstruction not simply of political but also of aesthetic agency.

If the fly represents the outcomes available to the figure of action, the eponymous protagonist of "The Snayl" examines the well-established appeal of stoic, patient endurance.[69] As in "A Fly", this poem's speaker studies a tiny creature from a distance and considers its behaviour a potential moral lesson. The poem's confident opening line "Wise Emblem of our Politick World" makes clear that the snail should be emulated in its orientation towards that world. "Politick" as an adjective means a "judicious, expedient, sensible; skilfully contrived" action or, more ambivalently, a person either prudent or scheming, one who temporises rather than commits wholeheartedly to an action. "Politic" makes the snail supremely well-adapted to and capable of taking advantage of the conditions in which it finds itself, unlike the heedless impulses of the protagonist of "A Fly aboute a glasse".

In the emblem book tradition, the snail serves as a model of self-possession that is startlingly literal. Randolph Wadsworth has convincingly identified the influence of the snail emblems in Jacobus Camerarius' *Symbolorum et Emblematum* (1590-1604) on the snail poem by Lovelace, immediately following "The Snayl" in *Posthume Poems*.[70] In the 1604 edition of Camerarius" work, there are four consecutive snail emblems in the fourth century of emblems.[71] The motto and explanation of the second expressly reads like the counterpoint to Phaeton. Its motto "Nec Te Quaesiveris Extra" is followed by the explanation "non tibi tela nocent latitanti, erumpere at ausum / Configunt: temere qui ruit, ille perit.:" (Do not overreach yourself. No spears injure the hidden; the impulsive and reckless perish).[72] The third praises the value of slow and unstinting labour as essential to genuine merit.[73] The snail's emphasis on slowness, on concealment, on unshowy, hard-earned wisdom contrasts with Phaeton's bolting, immature and self-destructive desires. Lovelace's poem even celebrates the snail as a "new Phoebus" (l. 20). For Wadsworth, based on these allusions, "The Snayl" is a confident Royalist exercise, a poem that communicates its assurance of eventual victory through the snail, whose many emblematic uses stress its unshowy yet complete virtues, and its "indefatigable striving" towards its goals.[74] Erna Kelly reads the speaker's tone as one of "marvel" at the snail's example of "being able to live fully within whatever circumstances one finds oneself".[75] In both readings the poem is an encomium to its tiny subject. Both readings assume a relatively straightforward mapping of the analogical interpretative practices of the emblem

tradition onto the poem. Yet the poem's depiction of the snail's body produces a more distorted picture of the relationship between speaker and subject and greater uncertainty about the lessons it teaches.

In her recent study of the emblems of Hester Pulter, who is writing largely contemporaneously with Lovelace, Rachel Dunn argues that Pulter's book of emblems represents a larger crisis in the mode. In many of Pulter's emblems, "the analogical process collapses" and the moral symbols become "anti-emblems", "a foil illuminating the disparity" between the moral universe of the emblem and a contemporary reality that is beyond any analogical parallel.[76] "The Snayl" places similar pressure on the analogical process by overloading the analogy to the point of parody.

The snail is presented a tiny model of exceptionally closely integrated social, familial, political and religious systems. Its mode of reproduction is both mysterious and unnatural:

> Thou thine own daughter then, and Sire,
>
> That Son and Mother art intire,
>
> That big still with thyself dost go,
>
> And liv'st an aged Embrio; (27-30)

These lines unite a cycle into a single moment. A vision of self-sufficiency, the snail both lacks all relational ties and simultaneously contracts them into an even tighter unit: a vision of total security. The internal space of the body provides a refuge – a reduction down of the sanctuary of the hearth and house of "The Grasshopper" – where all family members are simultaneously contained. It offers an extraordinary fantasy of possession, not simply of the self but of future and past selves, of selves in potential, selves as lived, selves of different ages and sexes. It is its own example, endlessly copying itself. Yet these fantasies which the snail embodies come with the associated risk of total loss, created by its sole responsibility for regeneration. Dying of fright caused by a dog or gun, "[s]o thine own womb, concludes thy Tomb". (l. 36)

The poem does not end her but shifts to consider the social hierarchy, the snail transforms into the husband of a great estate (a brief reminder of the fate of sequestered Royalists), a monarch and a monk. The human institutions referred to – both monarchy and church – are of course lost and the snail is left to exercise the privileges and responsibilities of monarchy.

> Then after a sad Dearth and Rain,
>
> Thou scatterest thy Silver Train;
>
> And when the Trees grow nak'd and old,
>
> Thou cloathest them with Cloth of Gold

Which from thy Bowels thou dost spin,

And draw from the rich Mines within. (45-50)

In an echo of Philamore/Cotton, the snail's regal benevolence clothes the needy from its never-ending store. The snail is a metaphor for a royalism sustained and guaranteed by natural correspondence, a correspondence that argues the signs of natural monarchy are everywhere the diminished cause might care to look. This pregnant hermaphroditic snail, excreting bodily fluids that turn into clothing, maps unexpectedly onto the somatic images that characterise the flayed poet and his pregnant muse. Cloth of gold is typically spun from silk, originally a cocoon spun from the body of the silkworm. Here the thread is snail slime and in this sense occupies the same category as the human parchment of "Upon a Lady with Child". Innards turn outwards in order to clothe the vulnerable naked, whether old or young. A verse form inspired by the snail appears to have the capacity to clothe its subjects.

Yet the juxtaposition of the cloth of gold with the bodily fluids of a snail introduces a gentle subversion of the politics of natural correspondence. Representations of a body losing its organic integrity, Jonathan Sawday argues, are concerned with a larger loss of integrity within a system influentially modelled on a coherent correspondence between biological, environmental and social structures.[77] The poem keeps returning to the bodily reality of the snail, and to images of it as or in jelly, dissolving in and oozing matter. These images are deftly managed by a teasing mock-admiration and

mock-envy of this extraordinary figure. The snail can live in its country as a human monarch, his priests and impoverished followers cannot. Yet these affects also register a resistance to the snail's qualities. The logic of envy dissolves the snail's role and promise as an exemplar for the impoverished royalist. Envy, an agonistic emotion, produces a refusal to admire and emulate, the production of which, as we have seen, is a necessary part of the monarch's power. Davenant in his discussion of the exemplary hero of the new epic in *The Preface to Gondibert*, feared setting up contemporary figures for emulation would produce only envy in the onlooker: "whose deeds excelling theirs in their own sight, seeme to vpbraid them, and are not reuerenc'd as examples of virtue but envy'd as the fauours of Fortune".[78] Envy marks resistance to Davenant's proposed programme of moral reform through poetry because an envier is one who refuses to emulate the example he is offered. Lovelace's mock-envy may not be as hostile but his poem produces a creature impossible to emulate. In its excessive possession the snail reiterates to the speaker the loss of property in the self, in the nation, the monarchy and established religion consequent on the civil wars. Choosing the snail as the model to emulate will produce only a sense of being outdone by it, a perverse reading of the relationship between human and snail, yet one which maps onto the perversities of postwar England. The snail cannot properly exemplify because of its excesses; the speaker can no longer exemplify because of his losses.

These are the conditions which the "ugly feelings" in the *Posthume Poems* disclose. They represent a self-reflexive poetic engagement with their own disordered political moment that are principally concerned with the political and aesthetic consequences of the dissipation of once powerful feeling, feeling previously embodied, literally, in the monarch. This poetic is concentrated on moments of misapprehension, in which ambitious aspiration, self-display, eager sacrifice and Stoic resolution − all the standpoints of the Cavalier lifecycle – are looked at anew in the light of material failure. Ultimately the ugly feelings on display diagnose the crisis of occupying the subject position of exemplary Cavalier, when the subject is located outside the spaces in which that position made sense. The "tiny creature" poems that signify by their subjects' excessive, visceral commitment to the task at hand, seek, paradoxically, to articulate where the boundaries of Cavalierism's political and affective commitment lie. These feelings are necessary in order to "see" the situation in which the speaker finds himself and to provide a critical purchase on that situation. The deployment of "mock" tones in the *Posthume Poems* can serve to deny or disarm what might otherwise be a much more serious and disruptive challenge to the affective norms of Cavalierism, or, as we can see in "The Snayle", they can also be deployed to intensify that challenge, turning a diagnostic affect into a critical one.[79] In doing so, *pace* Hobbes, *Posthume Poems* positions lyric's "peeces" is the "poesy" for these times, the mode that best delineates the complex affective landscape of postwar royalism.

[1] Wood, *Athenae Oxoniensis*, 2.147.
[2] Wilkinson, ed. *Poems*, 38-40. Quotations from Lovelace and Marvell are from this edition. Lineation supplied.
[3] Loxley, *Royalism and Poetry,* 221.
[4] Gibson, Commonplace Book. The collection incorporates a number of sheets of varying sizes so the existing volume probably represents either a retrospective collection made post-1660 or an ongoing compilation of Gibson's prison papers that finishes in that year.
[5] Gibson, Commonplace Book, fo. 208r. The Latin tag derives from Claudian, Panegyric, ll. 299-300. The complete passage reads as: "The world shapes itself after its ruler's pattern, nor can edicts sway men's minds so much as their monarch's life; the unstable crowd ever changes along with the prince." (ll. 299-302).
[6] He signs his letter "yours immured" on fo. 208r and sketches the outside of his prison on f.161r giving it the title, "The house of my Pilgrimage".
[7] Gibson, Commonplace Book, fo. 161v. For Peter, see fo. 174v and fo. 175r-v6r.
[8]Ibid.,, fo. 159v.
[9] Scodel, *The Excess and the Mean,* 232.
[10] Corns, *Uncloistered Virtue*, 247; Hammond, "Uses of Obscurity," 228; Coiro, "Personal Rule," 209.
[11] Smith, *Literature and* Revolution, 253.
[12] Wilkinson, *Poems*, 57-58. Rechiardt, "Looking for Lovelace," 164, notes "Lovelace is hesitant about the powers of poetry in relation to those of painting."
[13] Loxley, "Poetry, Portraiture and Praise," 00-00.
[14] James, *Passion and* Action, 4. For the early modern humoral model of the passions, see Kern Paster, Rowe and Floyd-Wilson, eds. *Reading the Early Modern Passions* and Schoenfeldt, *Bodies and Selves*.
[15] Gladish, *Gondibert*; Zwicker, *Lines of Authority*, 22-28.
[16] Gladish, *Gondibert*, **00.**
[17] Corns, *Uncloistered Virtue*, 77. See also Wilcher, *The Writing of Royalism,* 308.
[18] Wilkinson, *Poems*, 5.
[19] Ibid., 2. Herrick's *Hesperide*s, published the previous year, had only two commendatory poems.
[20]Ibid., 8-9.
[21] Hammond, "Uses of Obscurity," 207; Lois Potter, *Secret Rites*, 153.
[22] As Potter points out, Marvell's poem draws a parallel between "the danger of the soldier going to war and that of the writer about to "appear" in print. Most the poems make a similar link. Potter, *Secret Rites*, 154.
[23] Wilkinson, *Poems*, 162-168.
[24] Semler, *The English Mannerist Poets*, 198.
[25] Ibid., 198; 199.
[26] Ngai, *Ugly Feelings*.
[27] Ibid., 11.
[28] Ibid., 10.
[29] Ibid., 1-37. Ngai uses the term power in senses which are drawn from Spinoza and, to a lesser extent, Hobbes (2, 9). Spinoza treats power as the capacity to increase or decrease our own contentment whether that contentment is to do with immediate bodily needs or more widely with the possession of money, honour, friendship or favour. This power resides in both ourselves and others and feelings act, in Ngai's reading, as an index of the waning, gathering, or maintaining of these powers. Spinoza, unlike Hobbes, is able to accommodate a model of passions which accept that feelings can index a diminishing power to act and even at times recognises that certain forms of feeling produce responses closer to inertia than action. See James, *Passion and Action*, 124-156.
[30]Ibid, 12.
[31] Wilkinson, *Poems*, 148-149.
[32] Jonson, "Volpone," 31.
[33] "Pilch, n.1" *OED Online*.
[34] Wilkinson, *Poems*, 169-174.
[35] Charron, *Of Wisdom*, 167. Quoted in James, *Passion and Action*, 9.
[36] As James notes, in the early modern period, desire is considered an emotion. See James, *Passion and Action*, 7.
[37] PDickerson, " "The Lanthorn's Side," 32.

[38] Traherne, *Christian Ethicks*, **00**. Quoted in Dickerson, 44.The comment forms part of Traherne's typological explanation of the dyed red rams" skins demanded as an offering by God in *Exodus* 25.5.
[39] Wilkinson, *Poems*, 78-79. Christopher Burlinson, ""Finest Gossamore"", **00**, quotes Herrick's "To the Little Spinners", which portrays a speaker stripped of his skin by Love, who asks for his household 'spinners" for a cobweb lawn to repair it. Herrick's characteristically tongue-in-cheek approach to re-clothing a poetic self exposed by emotion nonetheless offers the more conventional use of the image which Lovelace's poem seeks to disorder.
[40] "Pilch, n. 3" OED Online.
[41] Corns, *Uncloistered Virtue*, 250.
[42] See Skinner, "Hobbes and the Classical Theory of Laughter. The conciliatory role of laughter in Tudor humanist writing is discussed in Cathy Shrank, "Mocking or Mirthful?". Shrank notes that laughter was also seen as an emotion which made humans more like beasts precisely because it was involuntary.
[43] See Mennes and Smith, *Musarum Deliciae*, based on work by Mennes" pre-Civil War circle described in Raylor, *Cavaliers, Clubs and Literary Culture*. Numerous print miscellanies advertised their sociable qualities including *Songs and Poems of Love and Drollery* (1654), *Wit and Drollery* (1656), *Choice Drollery* (1656) and *Sportive Wit* (1656). Copies of the latter two were seized by Commonwealth licensers and the authors and printers of *Sportive Wit* were examined. One of John Crouch's licensed newsheets in the early 1650s was called *The Laughing Mercury*. See Rollins, *Cavalier and Puritan*; Smith, *Literature and Revolution*, 311-317.
[44] Hsueh, "Intoxicated Reasons," 46.
[45] Ibid.,29, 30.
[46] Ibid., 32.
[47] See Ngai, *Ugly Feelings*, 13 for a similar comment in relation to the oath.
[48] For a discussion of this tradition and the political significance of collective musical performance in non-tavern settings, see Wistreich, "Herrick's Charon Dialogues".
[49] Gladish, *Gondibert*, 45.
[50] Ibid.,11.
[51]Ibid.,53.
[52] Giamario, "The Laughing Body Politic," 314.
[53] Wilkinson, *Poems*, 122-123.
[54] Burton, *Anatomy of Melancholy*, 1.32-33.
[55] Potter, *Secret Rites*, 147.
[56] Wilkinson, *Poems*, 157-159.
[57] See for example, Lovelace's "A Black patch upon Lucasta's Face" which begins "dull as I was, to think a Court Fly,/Presum'd so neer her Eye;" Wilkinson, *Poems*, 129-130.
[58] Case, *A Sermon,* 9; see also Ashe, *Reall Thankfullnesse* and Brinsley, *Israel's Breaches*, 46.
[59] Philipps, *King Charles the* First; Evelyn, *An Essay*, 112; Cervantes, *Don Quixote*, 326.
[60] Ovid, *Metamorphoses, Volume 1,* 2.319-320; 323-4.
[61] Ibid. 2.56. See Rollenhagen, *Nucleus Emblematum*, emblem 22 and Wither, *Emblems, ancient and moderne*, 156.
[62] See Chalmers, " 'But not Laughing'", 00 for a subtle account of the "highly labile" idea of the Cavalier as horseman.
[63] Alciato, *Emblematum Liber*, sig. D3v.
[64] Ibid.
[65] K Enenkel, "Florentius Schoonhovius" 137; Alciato, *Les Emblemes*, 93. My translation.
[66] Erasmus, 'de Copia", 611. Cited in Campe, "Questions of Emblematic Evidence," 6.
[67] Erable, 'Shakespeare's *Richard II*," 74.
[68] Potter, *Secret Rites*, 80-85.
[69] Wilkinson, *Poems*, 136-137.
[70] Wadsworth convincingly links another snail poem by Lovelace ("Another") to Camerarius' distinctive treatment of the snail. Wadsworth, "On "The Snayle," 756-57.
[71] The final century which contains the snail emblems is posthumous and edited by his son Ludovic. Camerarius, *Symbolorum et Emblematum*.
[72] *Symbolorum et Emblematum*, Emblem XCVIII, Sig. b3[a]
[73] Its motto reads "Non Levis Ascenus: Disce, puer, virtutem ex me verumque laborem,/Si verae ornari laudis honore cupis." Emblem XCIX, Sig. b4[a].

[74] Wadsworth, "On "The Snayle"", 754.
[75] Erna Kelly, " Small Types of Great Ones," 100.
[76] Dunn, "Breaking a Tradition," 62.
[77] Sawday, " 'Mysteriously Divided'", 137.
[78] Gladish, *Gondibert*, 11.

Bibliography

Manuscripts

Gibson, Sir John. Commonplace Book, 1656-1660. Additional MS 37719. British Library.

Other Sources

Alciato, Andrea. *Emblematum Liber*. Augsburg, 1531. http://www.emblems.arts.gla.ac.uk/alciato/

Alciato, Andrea. *Les Emblemes*. Translated by Jean II de Tournes. Geneva and Cologny, 1615.

Ashe, Simeon. *Reall Thankfullnesse*. G. Miller for Edward Brewster, 1645.

Brinsley, John. *The Healing of Israel's Breaches*. London, 1642.

Burlinson, Christopher. " 'Finest Gossamore': Cavalier Materials and Fragile Metaphors." *The Seventeenth Century* 33, no. 4 (2017): 00-00.

Burton, Robert. *The Anatomy of Melancholy*. Volume 1. Edited by Thomas C. Faulkner, Nicholsa K. Keissling and Rhonda L. Blair. Oxford: Clarendon, 1989.

Camerarius, Jacobus. *Symbolorum et Emblematum ex Aquatibus et Reptilibus Centuria Quarta*. Leipzig, 1605.

Campe, Rudiger. "Questions of Emblematic Evidence: Phaeton's Disaster, with reference to Pierre Legendre's Theory of Emblems. In *New Directions in Emblem Studies*, edited by Amy Wygat. 1-24. Glasgow: Glasgow Emblem Studies, 1999.

Case, Thomas. *A Sermon Preached before the Honourable House of Commons at Westminster, August 22, 1645*. London: Ruth Raworth for Luke Fawne 1645.

Cervantes, Miguel de. *The history of the most renowned Don Quixote of Mancha*, trans by J. P. London: Thomas Hodgkin for William Whitwood, 1657.

Chalmers, Hero. " 'But not Laughing': Horsemanship and the Idea of the Cavalier in the Writings of William Cavendish, first Duke of Newcastle." *The Seventeenth Century* 33, no. 4 (2017): 00-00.

Charron, Pierre. *Of Wisdom*. Translated by Samson Lennard, (London, 1608).

Claudian, *Panegyric on the Fourth Consulship of the Emperor Honorius (A.D. 398)* in Claudian, Volume 1. Translated by M. Platnauer. Loeb Classical Library 135. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1922.

Coiro, Ann Baynes. "The Personal Rule of Poets: Cavalier Poetry and the English Revolution." In *The Oxford Handbook of Literature and the English Revolution*, edited by Laura Lungers Knoppers, 206-238. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012.

Corns, Thomas. *Uncloistered Virtue: English Political Literature, 1640-1660*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1992.

Dickerson, Phoebe. " 'The Lanthorn's Side': Skin, Soul and the Poetry of Thomas Traherne." In *Thomas Traherne and Seventeenth-Century Thought* edited by Elizabeth S. Dodd and Cassandra Gorman, 31-47. Cambridge: Brewer, 2016.

Dunn, Rachel. "Breaking a Tradition: Hester Pulter and the Emblem Book", *The Seventeenth Century*, 30, 1 (2015), 55-73.

Enenkel, Karl. "Florentius Schoonhovius" Emblemata partim moralia, partim etiam civile: Text and Paratext." In *Emblems of the Low Countries: A Book-Historical Perspective*, edited by Alison Adams and Marleen van der Weij, 129-148. Glasgow: Glasgow Emblem Studies, 2003.

Erable, Richard. "Shakespeare's *Richard II*", *Explicator*, 61, no. 2 (2003): 73-75.

Erasmus, "de Copia." In *Collected Works of Erasmus* vol. 24. Edited by Craig R. Thompson. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1978.

Evelyn, John. *An Essay on the first book of T. Lucretius Carus De Rerum Natura*. London: Gabriel Bedle and Thomas Collins, 1656.

Giamario, Patrick T. "The Laughing Body Politic: The Counter-Sovereign Politics of Hobbes's Theory of Laughter." *Political Research Quarterly* 69, no. 2 (2016): 309-319.

Hsueh, Vicki. "Intoxicated Reasons, Rational Feelings: Rethinking the Early Modern English Public Sphere." *The Review of Politics* 78 (2016): 27-57.

James, Susan. *Passion and Action: The Emotions in Seventeenth-Century Philosophy*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1997.

Hammond, Gerald. "Richard Lovelace and the Uses of Obscurity." *Proceedings of the British Academy*, LXXI (1985): 203-234.

Gladish, David F., ed. *Sir William Davenant's Gondibert*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1971.

Jonson, Ben, ed. *Volpone*. Edited by Richard Dutton. In Volume 7 of *The Cambridge Works of Ben Jonson.* Edited by David Bevington, Martin Butler and Ian Donaldson. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2012.

Kelly, Erna. "'Small Types of Great Ones': Richard Lovelace's Separate Peace." In *The English Civil Wars in the Literary Imagination*, edited by Claude J. Summers and Ted-Larry Pebworth, 81-101. Columbia, MO: University of Missouri Press, 1999.

Kern Paster, Gail Katherine Rowe and Mary Floyd-Wilson, eds. *Reading the Early Modern Passions: Essays in the Cultural History of Emotions*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2004.

Loxley, James. *Royalism and Poetry in the English Civil Wars: The Drawn Sword*. Basingstoke: Macmillan, 1997.

Loxley, James. "Poetry, Portraiture and Praise." *The Seventeenth Century* 33, no. 4 (2017): 00-00.

Mennes, Sir John and James Smith, *Musarum Deliciae*. London: Henry Herringman, 1655.

Ngai, Sianne. *Ugly Feelings*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2005.

Ovid. *Metamorphoses, Volume 1*. Translated by Frank Justus Miller. Revised by G. P. Goold. Loeb Classical Library 42. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1916.

Philipps, Fabian. *King Charles the First, no Man of Blood*. n.p.: 1649.

"Pilch, n.". *OED Online*. June 2017. Oxford University Press. http://www.oed.com/view/Entry/143815?rskey=DG4M96&result=1.

Potter, Lois. *Secret Rites and Secret Writing: Royalist Literature, 1641-1660*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989.

Raylor, Timothy. *Cavaliers, Clubs and Literary Culture: Sir John Mennes, James Smith and the Order of the Fancy*. Newark: University of Delaware Press, 1994.

Reichardt, Dosia. "Looking for Lovelace: Identity, Style and Inheritance in the Poetry of the Interregnum." Ph.D Diss., James Cook University, 2003.

Rollenhagen, Gabriel. *Nucleus Emblematum*. Arnheim & Utrecht, 1613.

Rollins, H. E. *Cavalier and Puritan*. New York: New York University Press, 1923.

Sawday, Jonathan. "'Mysteriously Divided': Civil War, Madness and the Divided Self." In Literature and the English Civil War. 127-143. Edited by Thomas Healy and Jonathan Sawday. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990.

Scodel, Joshua. *The Excess and the Mean in Early Modern English Literature*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2002.

Schoenfeldt, Michael. *Bodies and Selves in Early Modern England*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999.

Semler, Leslie. *The English Mannerist Poets and the Visual Arts*. London: Associated University Presses, 1998.

Shrank, Cathy. "Mocking or Mirthful?" Laughter in the Early Modern Dialogue." In *The Power of Laughter and Satire in Early Modern Britain, 1500-1820*. Edited by Mark Knights and Adam Morton, 48-66. Woodbridge: Boydell, 2017.

Skinner, Quentin. "Hobbes and the Classical Theory of Laughter." In *Visions of Politics, Volume 3: Hobbes and Civil Science*. 142-176. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002.

Smith, Nigel. *Literature and Revolution in England, 1640-1660*.New Haven: Yale University Press, 1994.

Wilcher, Robert. *The Writing of Royalism, 1628-1660*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001.

Wilkinson, C. H., ed. *The Poems of Richard Lovelace*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1930.

Wood, Anthony à. *Athenae Oxoniensis*. 2 vols. London, 1692.

Traherne, Thomas. *Christian Ethicks*. Edited by Carol L. Marks and George Robert Guffey. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1968.

Wadsworth, Randolph L. "On 'The Snayle' by Richard Lovelace." *The Modern Language Review* 65, no. 4 (1970): 750-70.

Wistreich, Richard " 'Thou & Ile sing to make these dull Shades merry': Herrick's Charon Dialogues." In *Lords of Wine and Oile: Community and Conviviality in the Poetry of Robert Herrick*, edited by Ruth Connolly and Tom Cain, 153-190. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008.

Wither, George. *A Collection of Emblems, ancient and modern*. London, John Grismond, 1635.

Steven Zwicker, *Lines of Authority: Politics and English Literary Culture, 1649-1689*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1993.

[79] Rosenwein, *Generations of Feeling*,